



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"The verb *nāba* means 'come around *in turn*'; for example, if you are playing a game in which the 'turn' comes to one player after another, your 'turn' is called *nauba*. Any thing that passes around from one to another is naturally termed a *nā'iba*, ordinarily pronounced *naibē*. . . . Again, this same word *nā'ibe*, *nāibe*, *naibe* is very common in all varieties of Arabic with the meaning 'turn of fortune,' and especially an *ill* turn of luck. Possibly the use of cards in divination might have given rise to such a designation. The cards might easily have been termed the 'fates' or 'turn of fortune' (*nawā'ib*, plural number), in which case each one of them would have been termed a '*naype*.'"

JOHN M. BURNAM.

#### LATIN *olios*

In Ewald and Loewe's well-known *Exempla scripturae visigothicae*, pl. II, from a codex of St. Augustine preserved at the Escorial in the "camarin de las reliquias." is in a cursive hand very hard to decipher as well as much abraded and damaged by the lapse of time, and the reading is sometimes uncertain. For instance, l. 20, after *aperiat* the editors suggest *tibi os tuum* for what they print in the text: *viz., bios* (following the verb *aperiat*). Now, if one will examine the facsimile very carefully, he will notice that elsewhere *b* has a loop twice as large as in this case, and that further along in the same line, there occurs *inter lineas* a circle just like the bottom of this supposed *b*; but in both cases we are in the presence of a blot. If we do away with it, there remains *olios*, which we offer as the earliest occurrence of the Romance word still *olho* in Portuguese, dating back into the seventh century.

JOHN M. BURNAM.

University of Cincinnati.

#### BRIEF MENTION

*Lewis Theobald, his Contribution to English Scholarship, with some Unpublished Letters*, by Richard Foster Jones (New York, Columbia University Press, 1919). In a commendably business-like preface the author answers the question that inquires into the purpose of his book. This purpose is a two-fold one. It relates both to the biography of Theobald and to his work and merit as a scholar. After Collins in the *D. N. B.* and Lounsbury in *The Text of Shakespeare*, Dr. Jones has discovered a contribution to biographical details in "a number of unpublished letters, written to Warburton, which throw some light on the period following the great satire, and make clearer the later relations of the two men." These letters, found in Brit. Mus. Egerton Ms. 1956, "supplement those given

by Nichols in *Illustrations of Literature*, vol. 2, pp. 189-656, beginning with December, 1729, and extending to the fall of 1736"; they are now published by Dr. Jones in an Appendix C (pp. 258-346), and duly considered in the main body of his book. The other and more important division of the author's purpose is to uphold the thesis "that the basic principles of critical editing in English were derived directly from the method employed by Bentley in the classics. In his work on Shakespeare Theobald adapted this method to a new field, and in turn was followed by scholars who did not confine their labors to the great dramatist."

The "Early Life" of Theobald is here begun with his removal to London at the age of twenty (1708) to practice the profession of his father, that of an attorney. Having been trained in a notably sound and inspiring knowledge of the classics at a school in Middlesex, he was also equipped with inclinations that were dominantly favorable to literary activity. There is accordingly a first chapter on literary pursuits, which preceded his *Shakespeare Restored* (1726). This was the period of Theobald's extraordinary activity in translating classic authors and contracting for translations that were never fully executed. The story is somewhat complicated, but Dr. Jones makes it all clear enough, and puts a just estimate on Theobald's scholarship and purpose and on such a detail as his dependence on Madame Dacier. Among the original compositions that fall in this period, *The Cave of Poverty* is sustained in its special significance, and Bodmer's letter of commendation is given in Appendix C. As to Theobald's relation to the key to *What D'ye Call It*, Dr. Jones puts an emphasis on the internal evidence of Theobald's manner and knowledge. Coming to the discussion of Parnell's *Zoilus*, nothing is found in it "satirically appropriate to Theobald at that time" when it is probable also that "Pope had never heard of him." Dr. Jones views the matter as follows: "If Pope had any particular critic in mind when he urged Parnell to write the treatise, I would hazard the guess that it was Bentley," to whom the name *Zoilus* had for a long time been frequently applied. "Furthermore, Parnell's description of *Zoilus* tallies so closely with that of Bentley given by the Christ Church Wits that it is difficult not to think the great critic was in Parnell's mind." The varied literary work of his early period is all carefully surveyed and also helpfully arranged in a chronological Appendix. Diversified as this literary work was, it proved to be the best preparation for subsequent preëminence in the textual and appreciative criticism of Shakespeare. This is well analyzed by Dr. Jones (pp. 66 ff.). Theobald was just enough of a poet to avoid the pitfalls of a purely logical mind. He understood better than did Bentley that "logic and poetry do not always agree so well as logic and fact" (p. 37). His occupation with the Greek dramatists, his experience as "the author himself of several dramas and various operas and pantomimes," and associations with the theater are to be reckoned as formative factors of a definite character, to which

is to be added an "intimate knowledge of Shakespeare's thought and diction," made indubitable in his writings of this period.

Theobald's qualifications for the achievement of his special eminence in textual criticism were stimulated to fruition by the particular movements in the literary and linguistic scholarship and culture of his day. The mind that was at all concerned with polite learning was then more or less occupied with contrasted propositions. Under the rubric of 'the ancients and the moderns' a process of eliciting contrasts became habitual. The story is well known, but it is gratifying to find that Dr. Jones has reviewed those aspects of it that are pertinent to his thesis with a fresh enthusiasm and in the candor of the unbiased investigator, to whom a prejudiced view is as distasteful as an overt untruth. The spirit of fairness, which "doth not vaunt itself," and a thoroness—the true attribute of fairness—which pursues truth industriously, characterizes this treatise so consistently as give it an important place among trustworthy books. It makes clear the scholarly merits and personal disposition of Theobald, turning many a traditional judgment into testimony favorable to him and of no slight disadvantage to the reputation of Pope. In all this there is again the old material to put to the test the author's ability to rehandle a subject in an organic manner so as to make it yield definite results.

Bentley's method of textual criticism and his influence in establishing an almost exclusive meaning for criticism is discussed in a chapter entitled "The Rage for Emending"; and it is shown how this was met by the opposing party of polite scholars and literati. It is the opposition that is yet kept alive in some form by superficial advocates on both sides of the controversy.

The history of the study of English authors contains no more fundamentally important chapter than that in which it is shown how Theobald was brought to apply the classical scholar's principles of textual criticism—made conspicuous by the genius of Bentley—to the text of Shakespeare. The care for significant details and for the exhibition of underlying principles with which Dr. Jones has composed his form of this chapter gives an indisputable value to his treatise. His exposition of Theobald's method in *Shakespeare Restored* cannot, without a loss, be neglected by the incipient scholar in English. At this point the discussion, in a later chapter, of the preface to Theobald's edition of Shakespeare is of special importance. "The need of research in editing an English text" is there emphasized for the first time, in what "may be justly considered the first expression of the modern method employed in critical editions." Opposition to the method mounted to a warfare; this high point of interest is well handled in the chapter entitled "The Period of *The Dunciad*." Here the spotlight is turned on the personal character of both Pope and Theobald. The disadvantage that falls to Pope's share is in strong contrast to the rescued merits of Theobald. The variorum edition of *The Dunciad* "was largely responsible for the character of Theobald that has come down to recent times."

This report can be corrected, but how can Pope be excused for petty resentment and deliberate misrepresentations? A quarrel was inevitable, for Theobald would not lay down the weapon of his superior scholarship. Pope's party grew apace and defined with increasing precision that its cause was the repudiation of critical scholarship, especially in verbal details—"the trivial pursuit of wrong-headed industry"—and ultimately levelled its aim also at Bentley, who was recognized as "the creator of the critical method."

To have Bentley drawn into close relationship with him was a compliment that proved to be somewhat embarrassing to Theobald, because of Bentley's unfortunate application of his method to the text of Milton. Theobald had to declare that his master had "out-done his own Outdoings." Theobald's edition of Shakespeare at last appeared and completed his vindication. Warburton's relation to the "Preface," foreshadowing unhappy consequences, is a prominent feature of the chapter in which the edition of Shakespeare is examined—a chapter that is important also for the biographical details that bring the story down to "Theobald's Later Life." To the end Theobald was an industrious scholar, always projecting more than came to fulfillment. He finally won acknowledged eminence, but the joy of triumph must have been grievously marred by the loss of Warburton's friendship, if indeed it was friendship on the part of the arrogant divine, against whose character as a background the final sketch of Theobald's character gains heightened effects of contrasts.

In the final chapter, "The Progress of the Method," the editors of English authors are shown to have followed Theobald's method in its essential accuracy and breadth and with acknowledgment of his leadership until "their work in turn became new centers of influence, so that by the last quarter of the century the later tribe of critics considered the method anybody's." Theobald became the subject of a twofold and inherently contradictory tradition, for "Pope's characterization of him was complacently accepted," while on the other hand he was acknowledged to have set up the true pattern for the editing of an English author. As time went on, however, Theobald the scholarly editor faded from the general as well as from the critical mind, and "Theobald the dunce survived." In this chapter it is first shown that Theobald's method of investigating the cultural circumstances and experience of an English author and of controlling the critical apparatus of his text with the thoroughness of a classical scholar had to displace the method of the poet-editor, who had found it easy enough to execute the trade-projects of a publisher. However, the author of this treatise is chiefly concerned to report with all necessary detail the work of the editors who may be called the immediate disciples of Theobald. This he has done with the judgment, industry, and taste required for a valuable contribution to the history of literary scholarship. Like all trustworthy history, this chapter is significant in its organic connections with the past and the future. In the future

here pointed out, no detail in connection with the influence of Theobald's method has a more peculiar significance than the 'Romantic' turning back to the literature of the nation's early and neglected periods.

J. W. B.

---

*The Influence of French Literature on Europe.* By Emeline M. Jensen, Ph. D. (Boston, Richard G. Badger, 1919, 132 pp.) Dr. Jensen has attacked in the brief space of her book a vast subject with a courage which cannot fail to win our admiration. This "little work of historical literary research" manifests an enthusiasm for France and her literature which disarms a critic, while an air of informality pervades the whole book and removes any suspicion of pedantry. A quotation from Dr. Henry Van Dyke begins the study, which is brought to a graceful close by another quotation from the author of the *Spoon River Anthology*.

Altho "ever since the early dawn of civilization, the French people have led the literary world," Dr. Jensen limits herself to the few centuries embraced by the *Chanson de Roland* and the philosophy of Bergson. With bold, rapid strokes she sketches for us the development of French literature, and reveals to us many new points of view. For example: "the Academy advanced scholasticism"; "Mme de Sévigné created a new kind of literature in the form of letters"; "he (Chateaubriand) wielded an immeasurably great influence in England which cannot be over-estimated"; "the French influence may have been very helpful to Spain, as there was but little of old literature there to build on." Similar striking statements, to be found on almost every page, show that the book has been written with a genuine independence of thought and a freedom from tradition.

"Ample references to larger and more complete works have been given." The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Nelson's *Encyclopaedia*, as well as other works of general reference, are frequently cited, but one misses any notice whatsoever to less complete works such as those of Lanson, Brunetière, or Petit de Julleville. In the field of comparative literature, or the study of literary influences in general, Dr. Jensen would seem, at least for herself, to have discovered America.

The spelling bears the same stamp of originality. Would either the Marquise or Julie recognize the *Hotel Rambuild*? The author of the *Dictionnaire historique et critique* is persistently referred to as *Boyle*. The distinguished Spanish scholar has lost half his name, as well as his hyphen, and becomes plain Kelly. Similar instances are too numerous to mention. As for the accents on the French words and quotations, Dr. Jensen is a law unto herself, altho she consistently omits the majority of them.

To appreciate fully the present work it must be read in its entirety. France will undoubtedly, as our authoress maintains, "continue to be in the future, the reigning queen of polite litera-

ture, quietly, yet in a thousand ways, exerting her influence for refinement and culture," but what in the mean while will happen if our young doctors of philosophy continue to write such works and our publishers run the risk of publishing them? J. F. M.

---

*Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister to enquire into the Position of Modern Languages in the Educational System of Great Britain* (His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918). This report is of great interest to all those interested in the question of Modern Language instruction in the United States, as well as in Great Britain, especially at this time, when the whole question has been re-opened in many places as a result of the experiences of the last few years. Much of it, of course, is not applicable to conditions in this country, for it is largely taken up with a presentation of the claim of *Modern Studies* as against too great emphasis on the Classics, and, with us, Modern Languages have not only long since won their place in the sun, but too often crowded the older instruction into the background, without always furnishing as full a measure of solid training, or the anticipated utility, in its stead.

For this reason, the term *Modern Studies* is of interest, for it is the desire of the British committee to bring about as thorough instruction in Modern Languages as is offered by the Classics in England, and this includes not only a mastery of the languages, but also careful study of the history, society, and institutions of the people in question, about whom less is generally known than about ancient Greece and Rome.

The report is a fine example of British thoroughness and scholarly system in such matters. It discusses, among other things, the history of Modern Language instruction in Great Britain, without concealing any of the deficiencies, past or present; the present needs as a result of the war and for future relations; Modern Languages from a cultural as well as from a practical point of view; training of teachers (who should all spend at least one year in the country whose language they are to teach), with suggestions as to scholarships and studentships to enable them to do this, and exchange of students and professors, recommending native British teachers instead of foreign for the higher posts, as being better able to recognize and meet the requirements of British students; honor examinations and other means of encouraging students to recognize the value of Modern Languages and put them on a par with the Classics. It recommends that only one foreign language be required, and even takes up the question of an international language such as Esperanto, advising a further study of its practicability, especially for those students who have not the time for thorough mastery of some other idiom. In short, many important questions are presented and discussed with impartiality and competence, and the work contains a large amount of suggestive materials for any one interested in the matter.

C. D. Z.